

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 to 20 are cancelled without prejudice. New claims 21-41 are presented for the Examiner's consideration. No admission or representation is made by the present argument other than that explicitly provided herein.

The Examiner stated that the specification discloses that the instant application claims benefit to a U.S. Provisional Patent Application and that the U.S. Provisional Patent Application is incorrectly listed as 60/525,959 and should be listed as 60/525,958. The Examiner is correct in this assertion, as the Applicant had previously submitted a letter of correction of domestic priority information to the USPTO on September 9, 2005, pointing this out. With this response, the Applicant submits specification replacement paragraph 0001 correcting the error in the specification such that the specification now refers to Provisional Patent Application No. 60/525,958.

The Examiner rejected original claims 1, 6-8, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for not providing enablement. The Examiner further stated that the method consists of a single step and is thus interpreted as a single means/single step claim under MPEP 2164.08(a). With this statement, the Examiner appears to be suggesting that the claims are overly broad. While the Applicant does not necessarily agree with the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, it is submitted that the rejection is rendered moot in view of the Applicant's cancellation of original claims 1-20 and presentation of new claims 21-41. New method claim 21 provides more detail than original claim 1 and recites more than one step. It is submitted that new claims 21-41 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

The Examiner further rejected original claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for insufficient antecedent basis. New claim 27, which corresponds to original claim 7, has been revised to correct this error.

The Examiner rejected original claims 1-4, 9-12, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0160817 to Salmimaa et al. ("Salmimaa"). The Examiner further rejected original claims 5-8 and 13-16 under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Salmimaa in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0248437 to Hellebust et al. ("Hellebust"). The Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter defined by new claims 21 to 41 is both new and non-obvious in view of Salmimaa and/or Hellebust for the reasons set forth below.

The present application is directed to a method and system for providing notifications of new events on a wireless device. The wireless device has a graphical user interface 'GUI' displayed on a display of the wireless device. The GUI has a main screen comprising an application portion for displaying icons for respective applications or functions for execution on the wireless device. The method comprises the steps of: providing on the main screen and in the application portion a plurality of application icons each representing an application for managing respective events on the wireless device, the application icons occupying a major portion of the main screen; and in response to a new event in respect of one of the applications, visually modifying the respective application icon in the application portion of the main screen to notify of the new event; wherein the application icons are maintained on the main screen continuously.

In contrast, Salmimaa concerns modifying icons in a context bar of a mobile terminal (Paragraph 0024). The context bar comprises a plurality of icons displayed along an edge of the display (i.e., a horizontal edge as shown in FIG. 1 or a vertical edge as shown in FIG. 2). The sizes of the icons are modified together in response to context values. The context values relate to variables associated with the icons, such as the prices of services or goods associated with the icons, the distance of the establishments associated with the icons from the location of the mobile terminal, etc. (Paragraph 0029).

The arrangement of icons along an edge of the display shown by Salmimaa is done because the mobile terminal of Salmimaa is fundamentally different from the wireless device presently claimed. The claimed wireless device GUI has a GUI having a main screen comprising an application portion for displaying icons for respective applications or functions for execution on the wireless device. Salmimaa does not disclose or suggest displaying icons in an application portion of the screen because the screen of Salmimaa is sufficiently large such that the icons are arranged along an edge of

the screen. As such, the mobile terminal of Salmimaa does not present the same technical challenges associated with the claimed wireless device of which the claimed subject matter is designed to address. For this reason, Salmimaa fails to teach or suggest many of the features recited in claim 21. Salmimaa additionally fails to teach or suggest providing on the main screen and in the application portion a plurality of application icons. Further, the change of size of the icons disclosed by Salmimaa is not in response to a new event in respect of one of the applications, as presently claimed. In contrast, Salmimaa discloses changing the size of all of the icons in response to context values, which are related to data gathered by the mobile terminal. As such, Salmimaa fails to disclose or suggest, in response to a new event in respect of one of the applications, visually modifying the respective application icon in the application portion of the main screen to notify of the new event. Further, the change in size of icons disclosed by Salmimaa presents an indication to a user of a relationship of the context values; it does not notify of a new event, as presently claimed.

Since Salmimaa fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited in claim 21, claim 21 is patentable over Salmimaa. Claim 33 claims a graphical user interface for use on a wireless device and recites many of the same features as claim 21 and is patentable for the same reasons. Claims 22-32 and 34-41 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 21 and 33 and are patentable for the same reasons.

Hellebust concerns a filtered in-box for voice mail, e-mail, pages, web-based information, and faxes. Hellebust does not appear to concern modifying icons in any way and therefore fails to cure the deficiencies of Salmimaa. It is therefore submitted that the claims are patentable over Salmimaa and/or Hellebust, whether taken alone or in combination.

Favourable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions in connection with the Applicant's submissions, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

OGILVY RENAULT LLP

Date: August 9, 2007

By /pjf/

Paul J. Field

Registration No. 34,963

Telephone (416) 216-3903

Fax (416) 216-3930

OGILVY RENAULT LLP
Suite 3800, Royal Bank Plaza, South Tower
200 Bay Street, P.O. Box 84
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2Z4
Canada